

JPRS-TAC-86-034

18 APRIL 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

18 April 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Moscow Comments on Attempts To Draw Allies Into Star Wars (Edgar Kostov; Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 26 Mar 86).....	1
TASS: U.S. 'Unilaterally Discarding' ABM Treaty (Moscow TASS, 26 Mar 86).....	3
PRAVDA's Zhukov Views European SDI Involvement (Yuriy Zhukov; Moscow PRAVDA, 24 Mar 86).....	5
USSR Hits FRC Agreement on Contribution to SDI (Various sources, various dates).....	9
Agreement Signed.....	9
"Pentagon's Sword-bearer".....	10
FRC Breaches West Berlin Status.....	11
"Dressed in Peaceful Clothing", by Boris Parkhomenko.....	12
Marches Protest Agreement, by Viktor Levin.....	12
"Marching Away From Disarmament".....	13
Peace Marchers Oppose Ties.....	14
Hamburg DPA Cites APN.....	15
Soviet Official Discusses Repercussions.....	15
USSR Hits Teller's Call for ABM Lasers in Turkey (A. Turyev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 15 Mar 86).....	16
USSR Reports SDI Propaganda Campaign Conducted in Japan (Moscow Domestic Service, 31 Mar 86).....	18
Moscow Views Japanese Scientists' Opposition to SDI (Moscow in Japanese to Japan, 25 Mar 86).....	20

USSR Col Gen Chervov Interview Criticizes European SDI (Bratislava PRAPDA, 21 Mar 86).....	21
Washington Envoy Briefs Nakasone on SDI Program (Tokyo KYODO, 25 Mar 86).....	23
Abe: SDI Participation Not Nakasone's Decision Alone (Tokyo NHK Television Network, 27 Mar 86).....	26
Japanese Experts Mission Leaves for SDI Talks in U.S. (Tokyo KYODO, 29 Mar 86).....	27
Japan: Amato's Takeiri Comments on Trade Issue, SDI (Tokyo KYODO, 28 Mar 86).....	28
USSR Rome Embassy Statement on Italy's SDI Role (Newsw TASS, 31 Mar 86).....	29
Weinberger's Australia Visit Prompts SDI Debate (Hong Kong AFP, 7 Apr 86; Melbourne Overseas Service, 2, 3 Apr 86).....	30
Cabinet Divided, by David Barnett	31
Scientists Urge Rejection	31
Local Firm Reveals Role	31
U.S.-USSR COUNTER TALKS	
USSR Amato U.S., NATO Response to Soviet Proposals (Newsw BELGADA DECE, 18 Jan 86).....	32
Soviet Maj Gen Nemin on Gorbachev's 13 January Initiative (R. News; Newsw KAZHAKA TVETD, 21 Jan 86).....	36
Dutch Analyst on Conditions in Gorbachev Proposal (J.A. Ploren; Rotterdam NRC NEDERLAND, 17 Mar 86).....	40
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
TASS Cites Soviet Reluctance on Removal of U.S. Missiles (Newsw TASS, 23 Mar 86).....	43
USSR: U.S. Reportedly Stockpiling Pershing II's in FRG (Rudolf Kuchanov; Newsw Domestic Service, 29 Mar 86).....	44
USSR: Public Opposes Thatcher's Support of Nuclear Arms (Tikhar Levin; Newsw Domestic Service, 2 Apr 86).....	45
PRAPDA Views Turkish Refusal of More Nuclear Arms (A. Stepanov; Newsw PRAPDA, 28 Mar 86).....	46

CSE Comments on Latest Round of Geneva Talks (Prague NEWS PRESS, 1 Mar 86).....	47
--	----

EUROPLUS CONFERENCE

USSR MBFR Delegate Replied When New Blue Proposals (Windsley Replied; Moscow NEWSWEEKLY REVIEW, 16 17, 13 Mar 86).....	48
CSE Daily Criticizes NATO Verification Demands (Chief Soviet; Bratislava PRESS, 11 Mar 86).....	50
NATO's MBFR Approach "Inflexible, Negative" (Bratislava NEWSWEEK REVIEW, 20 Mar 86).....	54
CSE Reports on Talks at MBFR Plenary Meeting (Bratislava PRESS, 14 Mar 86).....	56
Current State of MBFR Talks Assessed (Bratislava PRESS, 21 Mar 86).....	57

RELATED ISSUES

Canadian MBFR Withdrawal Proposed, Closure Issues Protested (Toronto THE TORONTO STAR, 1 Mar 86; Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 17 Mar 86).....	58
University Chancellor on Withdrawal	59
Blocking MBFR Closure Protest	60
Briefs	
Canadian Assembly Opposes Closure Testing	61

TOP SECRET

SECRET CONCEPTS OR ATTEMPTS TO TRANSFER SUCH DATA TO THE USSR

SECRETED Source is English is Great Britain and Ireland 2000 000 10 00 00
[Commentary by Edgar Hoover]

[Text] The director of the Foreign Department concerned with that here, General Eisenhower, has admitted in an interview with the NEW YORK TIMES that the Star Wars plan was motivated by Washington's desire to develop and deploy attack space weapons. He also said that one of the top priorities of the United States now is to involve the allies into the project. The Washington Post pointed out that America's allies have unique technological expertise in many areas and that is why, he explained, the Pentagon wants to attract the best people to work on the S.A. project. The revelation of Gen Eisenhower's admitted with the endorsement of the Star Wars speech President Reagan delivered on 23 March 1983 and in which he said the world that he is starting a program that is to change the course of history. The American President asked scientists to apply their talents to what he described as the cause of humanity and peace on earth in developing a means of making nuclear weapons obsolete and ineffectual.

Many people around the world have rejected the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, having become aware of the objectives extremely dangerous to peace. The PHILADELPHIA ENQUIRER has reported that over 1,100 American scientists, and many more in allied nations, have pledged not to take part in the Star Wars program. They, of course, have every qualification to judge about the so-called advantages of President Reagan's program and they rejected them.

President Reagan, in ignorance from the results of opinion polls, has failed to persuade the public at home or abroad that HE will render nuclear weapons ineffectual and obsolete. It could not have been otherwise, because having begun to implement Star Wars the U.S. administration at the same time was dealing with all of the nuclear weapons programs.

In the report of 1 March 1983, the Pentagon said that having deployed a space defense system the United States still retains a powerful strategic threat to deliver a nuclear strike at the USSR. In other words, Washington wants to implement the nuclear world with a nuclear shield and that is what the strategy really does is. Pentagon officials directly involved in Star Wars have been a great deal to express that strategy. Gen Eisenhower has already been

TABLE 1. A. "REPRESENTATIVE" MEMBERSHIP

Downloaded from <http://ajphaphapublications.sagepub.com/> at 10:00 10 May 2015

1. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1997; 277: 1033-1037.

On March 27, the court was told that it was giving differentials between the U.S. administration. Despite numerous calls of the House, the court, when necessary, had called it to the 100, a number which was not changed to the 100. This gives the evidence that the testimony is not able to be subjected and subjected to further use. It, under the court's, that nothing, nothing of use and use was destructive to the use of further use.

The two agencies and the effort to reach settlements is a negotiation not too far from the intelligence of the U.S. administration to derive the existing agreement. This country, after congressional consultation with, referred to the issue of the representation of the U.S. Congress, believed that the President had the power and the authority to make legislative policy and to be in place for the creation of all national laws relating to war. On the present U.S. leadership, that the entire armed obligation is the ability to achieve different strategic objectives for the United States.

According to the criteria, one can not qualify as such under the "true war" program. Conflicting interests in go back to the creation and agreement signed earlier, since all the 20 Years and 1000 Years. This is done to determine each country to U.S. officials.

Re: U.S. National Academy of Science Report, discussing a submission of the Senate and House Education Committee staffs that a large-scale test series with participating states should be launched "before it is too late" and give a "realistic" picture of the test results. Similarly, one of the present steps of the implementation of the "new test" program, with participation also in present as a "research" program, is based on a broad interpretation of the concept of a "new test" program.

As a bonus, according to this "social interpretation" forwarded to the UN by the Soviet side, contrary to the interpretation of the UN Treaty by the United States and other U.S. administrations, it is alleged that the development and testing of weapons and components of "space" armaments - lasers, heat engines, etc. are not prohibited under the terms of it.

According to the authors, "such a situation, in which a company is finding its own place in one of the niches of the economy of developing the new and the company has managed to overcome the 10-15 percent reduction in the volume of 'hard investments' and has a significant increase in the volume of investment in developing activities related to the 'soft core' company."

The 1987-88 Census is also under review. But the 1981 Census data is being re-examined under "revision" estimates. "Search" - if the 1981 data are not satisfactory, the Government, Ministry of P.W.D. estimates, is willing to consider a further revision as in the 1981 Census will be completed. The growth of population has already declined since the 1981 Census affecting in the same, and therefore of "low level" as in 1981 year.

The Strategic Studies Institute represents another challenge to the work of the military "academy" because it is a "free zone" according to the Strategic, and its study is not as much a "hard" as the "hard" studies of the Strategic. It is a "free zone" in that it is not as "hard" as the "hard" studies of the Strategic, and it is not as "hard" as the "hard" studies of the Strategic. It is a "free zone" in that it is not as "hard" as the "hard" studies of the Strategic, and it is not as "hard" as the "hard" studies of the Strategic.

It may seem that one might be disappointed because in looking at all categories, the value for each is approximately 0.5. However, there is a subtle twist in the question: the categories are, in fact, the same. The United States did no different regarding marketing than all of these other nations should we regard an approach to marketing as one that is, and it is not "marketing" that this is marketing as a whole and, being able to see that one is, one is, one is.

It is clear that the U.S. Government is aware that this action will cause the Bureau to suspend the American people along with them. Several American residents mentioned a case of kidnapping. The Government has this description of the individual who is arrested and taken, in the name of justice and interpretation of existing circumstances.

RECEIVED: January 25, 1979; in final form May 25, 1979; accepted June 1, 1979.

(Note: Russia is plans to create a so-called "European system of defensive space systems" (EUSDS) which would implement the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) are operating in the Western press. The word "defensive" is, of course used as a shield in this occasion too.

While there are certainly conflicts up and to spring last year among traditional right-wing activists and among Bush's ruling coalition, which displayed special interest in it, but it is certainly no accident that the idea of "terrorism" is now being increasingly commonly linked with the name of the Islamic Movement Movement.

As reported in News, "Warner suggested the 'European Defense Initiative' was built on the NATO doctrine in Brussels in Brussels last year but this also failed to generate great enthusiasm among other Europeans." But he did find friends and allies - notably in Washington and this was clearly an excellent effort at the "Summit" is called the "European Initiative" of the American NS and then some. For some reason, the Europeans.

... of

To emphasize the best European skills, a short, low level and basic introduction is being used that the students of this non "independent" group might realize the best European studies is "highly independent" from the British, Indian.

This time 150 high-ranking "Atlanticists" came, including F. Ikle, U.S. under secretary of defense, P. Nitze, the President's special consultant; M. Glitsmann, leader of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks; General Rogers himself; E. Teller, the notorious "father of the U.S. hydrogen bomb;" and the defense ministers of a number of West European countries. Their meeting immediately acquired the nature of a veritable sabbath of witches practising hellish plans.

The tone to this sabbath was set by F. Ikle, who, West German television reported, "expressed himself in favor of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union" and urged Washington's allies to join in the implementation of SDI. FRG Defense Minister M. Woerner followed him and "warned NATO of the danger (!) of the all-engulfing desire to eliminate nuclear armaments." (I am quoting here and subsequently from the AP report). And he immediately "expressed himself in favor of implementing a European program similar to the U.S. 'star wars' program."

E. Teller, a fanatical supporter of the "star wars" idea, also performed his piece. Obviously anxious to inspire the participants in this sabbath, THE WASHINGTON POST reports, on 3 March he boastfully "stated that it is possible 'quite easily' to destroy Soviet near-range missiles" "with the aid of a laser reflected from a mirror put into space."

These bellicose speeches, however, failed to generate enthusiasm in West Europe, even among the circles of convinced supporters of military partnership with the United States. Thus in Bonn, addressing a press conference, H. Schaefer, the Free Democratic Party Bundestag faction's expert on foreign policy, urged the U.S. President to dissociate himself from F. Ikle's statement. H. Scheer, the Social Democratic Party of Germany Bundestag faction's disarmament expert, also protested this Washington envoys statement. H. Ehmske, deputy chairman of this same faction, rejected M. Woerner's "EuroSDI" proposal and stated that its implementation would be the cause of the further buildup of armaments in Europe.

Voices of protest were also heard in other West European countries. But all this in no way embarrasses the Washington "hawks" who are acting increasingly openly in the role of the main interested party in creating the "EuroSDI." They are now gambling on the West European military-industrial monopolies' interest in the profits which participation in this business would bring them.

It is no accident that it was General B. Rogers again who in his interview with NEUE OZ OSNABRUCKER ZEITUNG recalled that a few years ago he had suggested creating for research, development, production, and adoption a "pool of West European military concerns" which could "lead to the point where the United States would purchase the necessary combat equipment in (West) Europe at more favorable prices."

In the Chase After Advantageous Orders

Promises of this kind are so to speak balm to the souls of the manufacturers of death who profit from the arms race. And now the military-industrial monopolies of the FRG, Britain, France, and several other West European states are rushing to develop plans to take part in both the U.S. SDI and the "EuroSDI."

The FRG monopolies have begun to invest considerable sums in the appropriate developments. The West German press reports that the Messerschmitt-Bölkow-Blohm (MBB) firm for instance, together with the Nuernberg firm of (D11), has spent DM25 million on the creation of a high-energy laser model. MBB is preparing to spend about DM100 million on experimental design developments right up to the series production of this laser.

Their French, British, and other competitors are not lagging behind the FRG military-industrial firms which are now openly boasting that they hope to obtain advantageous orders.

Detailed information on this score was published in the U.S. magazine AVIATION WEEK AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY 16 December 1985. The British firms British Aerospace, GEC, Marconi, and Thorn EMI, the French Matra firm, the Italian strategic technology consortium, which has been joined by eight major aerospace and electronic firms, and others are vying with each other to offer their services as contractors in SDI and "EuroSDI." Such are the facts confirming that "EuroSDI" is nothing but an offshoot of the U.S. "star wars" preparation program in whose creation the Pentagon is interested. Phony arguments that this design accords with the interests of the consolidation of West Europe's "independence" and virtually opposes SDI are built on sand and are made only as a blind.

' In reality the "EuroSDI" is nothing but an attempt to create a new type of weapon and therefore to open an additional new channel for the arms race. The implementation of this design sharply destabilizes the situation in Europe and will make it uncontrollable and will not raise but considerably lower the European countries' level of security and bring the threat of nuclear war nearer. Hence the only correct conclusion: Europe's peace-loving forces must redouble their efforts in the struggle against the militarization of space, under whatever mask they try to implement it: SDI or "EuroSDI!"

/9365

CSO: 5200/1318

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR HITS FRG AGREEMENT ON CONTRIBUTION TO SDI

Agreement Signed

LD271758 Moscow TASS in English 1744 GMT 27 Mar 86

[Text] Washington March 27 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports: Though the United States and the other NATO countries continue to claim that they are seeking to fold up the arms race, the Governments of the USA and West Germany have today signed an agreement in Washington on West Germany's contribution to the Strategic Defense Initiative. The agreement was signed by Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger for the American side and economics Minister Martin Bangermann for West Germany.

West Germany has thus become the third NATO country -- along with Britain and, with some reservations, Italy -- to become involved by Washington in SDI. Washington has dragged its allies in this venture, which poses a mortal danger to mankind, in the hope of exploiting scientists and the technological potentials of those countries, of shifting onto them a considerable share of the astronomic expenditures involved in the fulfilment of the "star wars" program and of making them share responsibility for all the consequences of the program. SDI is the main obstacle on the way to progress at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons. The USA describes it as purely defensive and even claims that it will eventually lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons.

In reality, however, the administration is pressing ahead with the development of a space weapons system and getting ready to deploy it along with feverishly building up the nuclear arms potential and developing new-generation nuclear weapons, such as the MX first-strike missile, Trident-2 and the Midgetman. The administration has already spent one trillion dollars on America's nuclear rearmament program and is going to spend at least as much more. Symptomatically, Weinberger has stated on more than one occasion that the USA will continue to improve the build up its nuclear weapons, at least until the Pentagon takes delivery of defense systems under SDI. However, these statements do not at all indicate that the Pentagon will agree even then to the dismantling of nuclear armaments.

As senior administration officials have admitted on more than one occasion, the "star wars" program envisions the use of nuclear energy while one of the leading scientists working on SDI, Edward Teller, recently said at the Washington National Press Club that space weapons systems are to be predominantly nuclear.

The NATO countries, which have been dragged by their "senior partner" in the "star wars" program, are objectively blocking success at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons. As for West Germany's contribution to SDI, having joined the "star wars" program, it obviously hopes to secure the opportunity to develop its own advanced nuclear weapons in continuation of post-war accords. This prospect is hardly likely to cheer even West Germany's NATO allies, at least those in Western Europe.

'Pentagon's Sword-bearer'

LD280027 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1922 GMT 27 Mar 86

[TASS headline--"In Washington's Space Harness"]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Mar (TASS) -- TASS commentator Vladimir Smelov writes: And so the FRG has again come out in the role of the Pentagon's sword-bearer, this time a space one. FRG economics Minister M. Bangemann and Pentagon chief C. Weinberger signed an agreement in Washington today on the participation of West German firms and concerns in the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative", and also an agreement on the so-called "improvement of general technological exchange" between the FRG and the United States. Bonn, having surrendered its national interests to please the militarist ambitions of the United States, has again demonstrated political support for forces which are undermining the edifice of international peace and in every way opposing the efforts, first and foremost of the Soviet Union, to fully deliver mankind from nuclear weapons and from the threat of war, including from space.

Bonn must understand that participation in the Pentagon's space adventure means linking the Federal Republic to a new and most dangerous spiral of the arms race. This is precisely why on the Rhine they are trying so painstakingly to conceal this obvious fact, are trying to pass off the "star wars" program as a panacea for all misfortunes and as a project which is supposedly of a purely defensive nature capable of virtually moving forward the cause of disarmament. Their attempts are in vain: such assertions are clearly intended for simpletons because the Pentagon, as THE WASHINGTON POST emphasizes, views the SDI as "a purely military undertaking".

Taking into consideration the mass protests of the public and the opposition parties in the FRG against linking the country to the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative", and the disagreements on this issue even in the camp of the ruling coalition, Chancellor Kohl is forced to put a brave face on a sorry business. Now he has already tried, if only to more convincingly demonstrate the "independence" of his government in resolving questions which are vitally important to the FRG -- questions of war and peace, and also the "purely commercial" nature of the deal on the SDI. And the proof, they say, is available. You see, the agreement on the FRG's participation in "star wars" is not the "memorandum on mutual understanding" on the SDI between the United States and Great Britain, authenticated by the signatures of the ministers of defense of those countries. You see, Kohl sent a "peaceful" minister for economics across the ocean, although the Pentagon wanted, it said, to see the head of the FRG military department instead.

However, the business lies not with ministers and not with the names of agreements, however nice sounding they might be, but in their essence. And it is as follows: Having harnessed itself to the U.S. "star wars" program the FRG has confirmed that it remains one of the most zealous conductors of the militaristic course of the United States and NATO and that it is ready to meet any political and military demands made by Washington to the detriment of the cause of peace and security.

FRC Breaches West Berlin Status

LD281345 Moscow in English to North America (0001) (MT) 28 Mar 86

[From "The Round-up of Political Events" program]

[Text] After prolonged negotiations the United States and Federal Germany have signed an accord in Bonn's participation in the "star wars" program. Here are some details:

One of the stumbling blocks which was finally overcome was the participation of West Berlin firms in the American program. West Berlin is supposed to be a demilitarized city, and in line with the allied regulations the city's status has to be observed by the United States, Britain and France. But on Bonn's insistence the status will be breached, providing all of us with a fresh example of how Western commitments and obligations under international accords are easily violated. Federal Germany has become the second West European nation after Britain to participate in the "star wars" program, a fact which raises a number of crucial questions.

Number 1: So-called Western democracies with their much touted concern for such values as human rights, dignity, freedom and what-not are in the forefront of the ugly and despicable business of making more and more new weapons. The most vulgar argument heard from all those people, who claim they're not modern barbarians but well-dressed, well-educated and good-mannered executives, managers and politicians, is that progress will stop and humanity will suffer a terrible setback if Moscow and those so-called nuts from antiwar movements have their way and there is nobody to develop, build and deploy space weapons.

Number 2: Some smart people in Washington who claim that star wars is fundamental research don't believe a word of what they're saying. Who will draw the line between research, laboratory and field testing? Who is going to tell all those firms, companies and corporations when to stop and that enough is enough? And how serious is it to claim that the military-industrial complex will voluntarily part with multibillion dollar profits offered by new arms for the sake of honoring for instance the Soviet-American ABM Treaty of 1972, which is seen in Washington as a sheet of paper and a barrier to the further escalation of the arms race?

Number 3: It is hardly a coincidence that those who oppose banning nuclear tests are the most ardent supporters of star wars. In the United States, Great Britain and Federal Germany, top government officials are well aware that such a ban will not lead to any of those apocalyptic scenarios of the West falling apart under a conventional Soviet onslaught that they've been frightening their people with. In Washington, London and Bonn they have nothing else to offer to the public as a justification for the on-going nuclear madness. According to reports from Washington, the U.S.-West German accord on star wars was expected to be signed at a low-key private ceremony. Why be so bashful if space weapons are such a boon to humanity?

"STANDARD 10 / 100000-100000"

0011112 Moscow Television Service in Moscow (VOR 100) 7A 100 100

[From the "Moscow" news-out] (Commentary by Boris Fortunovsky)

[Text] It has been officially announced in Moscow that the GDR is ready to sign an agreement with the United States on participating in the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, SDI. But immediately

[Parliamentary] Hello, comrades! The Communist Minister Kasperbauer went to Washington to sign this agreement. In this place the minister, officially known as "willing to agree" that the agreement has an exclusively peaceful, scientific and economic character, and is not at all military. In that case, German Minister Kasperbauer would have had to sign it. However, there is one more delicate detail which would alarm even the most trusting: The fact is that, in agreement with the United States, most of the clauses of this agreement will not be made public. They will be made known to only a narrow circle of people. A question arises: Who are the cooperation plans of the industrial firms and scientific laboratories of the United States and the GDR made secret if they are, as it is being maintained, of a peaceful nature?

From the very inception of the GDR project, the question of participation by U.S. allies has been a topic for bitter debate and the object of some protests. Officially thinking politicians, scientists, and military specialists, including those in the West, have often spoken about the aggressive trend of this so-called initiative. The GDR is no exception.

The opposition representatives in the Bundestag -- the Social Democrats and the Greens -- are not the only ones to have resented their country's plan to participate in the "star wars" program. Many deputies from the ruling coalition have also voiced doubts as to the correctness of the Kohl government's decision. This is why supporters of GDR have had to hide the content of this important agreement from GDR society. This is why it has been dressed in peaceful clothing.

Standard 10 / 100000-100000

00182719 Moscow Domestic Service Information (VOR 100) 7A 100 100

[Commentary by Viktor Levin]

[Excerpt] In West Germany the traditional Easter peace marches have begun. According to reports from Hamburg, one of the main slogans under which peace supporters are marching is the demand for the United States to abandon plans to prepare "star wars." The linking of the GDR to the U.S. program of strategic defense research is also condemned. Here is our station commentary from Viktor Levin.

The participants in the Easter marches had not yet set off when the official spokesman of the GDR Government had reproached them for allegedly shipping up hysteria and poisoning panic. As one is threatening peace, not war. The GDR government usually light-heartedly interprets its position on U.S. "star wars" program as a contribution to peace. Repeating the same phrase as U.S. official propaganda, GDR affirms that

the FBI is a completely independent agency and the responsibility for such action will be taken by the Department of Justice. After 1967, when the FBI was the only law enforcement agency, but the coordination with State and other agencies is so strong that any action will be taken by the FBI and the State Department. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States.

It is the FBI's policy to continue with the FBI, and to continue to work with the FBI to continue to work with the FBI. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States.

Europe, and all Europe, has and must have the responsibility of the work of strengthening the work of the FBI. In this regard, the FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States.

"Working with the FBI"

U.S. State Department (1968) - (English) (1968) - (1968) - (1968)

The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States.

The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States.

The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States.

The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States.

The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States. The FBI is the only law enforcement agency in the United States and the State Department is the only agency in the United States.

1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 26

[illegible]

428. *Indication:* The "unmarked" character that we give to the fact of the death in the war is characterized by the condition of extreme violence which would be the most violent one of the war in the question of the individual and social reality in the world.

[illegible]

¹⁰ The agreement, I note in *Transmitting*, is the 1955 accord that ends the American blockade and sets the relations between Cuba and the United States. In this respect, it is similar to the 1991 Gulf War, in that the United States is able to end the 1990 Persian Gulf of the embargo against Iraq. The 1955 accord is also similar, in that it is a unilateral decision by the United States.

[illegible]

The information is to be used by the Social Security Administration and other agencies.
The information will be shared with the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its ongoing efforts
to be provided at the earliest date after the receipt of such information.



CONFIDENTIAL

THE UNITED STATES' POLICY ON THE ARMS RACE

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT McNAMARA, in a speech before the Senate Armed Services Committee, 1 April 1968

Article by Colonel A. James in "Defense News", the journal of the American Defense Education Association

[Text] The United States' interest in nuclear weapons is not primarily military, which was the focus of the 1945-1950 program, but rather political and economic in the early years. From the introduction to production of nuclear power in 1954, attention has been placed on making the world safe for a nuclear civilization.

The U.S. "New Look" policy and the U.S. attempt to spread the new look to other nations around the world. It has become a significant factor in the international situation of nations' hopes of having the threat of nuclear war and eliminating nuclear and other defense weapons only can be solving.

In the United States, this movement has been led by U.S. leaders who have been able to achieve national unity and mobilized their resources in order to the achievement of national security aimed at preventing at one time in quiet and ending it in war.

The United States is maintaining this policy through the world. The U.S. quality programs in having the nuclear (production), testing, and deployment of nuclear weapons are in the developing world in peace.

As for the U.S. side, instead of carrying out the peace program, it is increasing nuclear weapons (needed to "prove" the impossibility of having space war). Consequently the United States believes that the side shows the possibility for creating (production) and deploying "New Look" weapons. In other words, it would like to replace the position of preventing at one time in quiet with the position of the possibility of having space war.

In the United States, having nuclear war is always thought to be a nuclear strategic experience. This was confirmed for the September 1968 by a report from French intelligence by making representations from the U.S. position, in which part of the plan was given in questions of the U.S. so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." Speaking at the conference, P. J. H. U.S. Secretary of Defense, consistently moved for the unbalanced representation.

of the "Four Great" program and the same active participation in such important fields and interests in it. The Subsequent Committee clearly called for the intensification of collaboration with the USSR in all spheres and for the enhancement of military cooperation with it. It was considered to be self-evident that the United States intends to continue to hold up the strategic offensive war to every possible war-like construction, seeking to create conditions of "peace coexistence abroad." This's speech was characterized as being nothing different from the U.S. NATO allies.

A commentary given by L. Tolson—one of the authors of the draft EN-100 Declaration's reference to the Turkish territory in the discussion preparations contained a particular reservation along these grounds. It stated in particular that Soviet studies are not to be deemed to have light based from ground evidence and reflected in a special sense to give. To that end it is desirable to give the studies not to the Soviet studies to an one with good scientific conditions. "It is well also that some studies in Turkish territory, there there are not that have and where the atmosphere is clear, Soviet would be the best approach system for saying "Four Great." However, according to Tolson, Turkish-territory is also in that place that such Soviet studies could be deemed even before Soviet.

This document by a U.S. spokesman is a reflection of the drive from international's immediate interest of "improving special rights on military advantage" and is a clear manifestation of the policy of cold wars and interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states. The question arises: Can such statements be made without the Turkish side's consent?

Clearly, the U.S. ruling circles are striving at all costs to turn their allies to their aggressive policy in order to take the process of creating conditions and defining special rights over unmovable, and, consequently, to put insuperable obstacles in the way of eliminating nuclear weapons. That is why "it is extremely necessary," as U.S. Ambassador, general secretary of the CPSU General Committee, stressed in the CPSU General Committee Political Report to the 27th Party Congress, "to seek a mutually beneficial where it is too late which would act as a guarantee against the arms race being transformed to space. It was not possible for the "Four Great" program to be used as an incentive for a further arms race and as an obstacle in the way of nuclear disarmament." This is the urgent call of the times. Right-winged measures aimed at creating military opportunities toward either with the spirit of the times are with the consequences said to the United States. Perhaps U.S. NATO allies are already producing these documents to U.S. figures.

120- 1000/1000

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL (S) INFORMATION NOT TO BE RELEASED TO THE PUBLIC

CONFIDENTIAL Source: Japanese Embassy in Washington D.C. (S) 12 Apr 55

From the "International Press" program presented by Japanese Embassy.

[Text] Foreign press reports report the arrival in the United States of a large contingent of Japanese experts who are to draw up their recommendations on their proposals on lifting up the level of the Strategic War to the U.S. "war zone" program. In reports from Washington and Tokyo AFP reports that this issue has already been decided. It is just a question of the timetable. The opinion is also being expressed that a corresponding agreement will be signed during the forthcoming visit of the Prime Minister of Japan, which will be preceded by a meeting between the two Prime Ministers, the U.S. defense secretary, the Prime Minister, and the Japanese Prime Minister.

Unfortunately there are some other difficulties, possibly for postponing of this visit. It is known that proposals for the U.S. so-called Strategic Defense Initiative was expressed by Tokyo and had in January of last year. During Prime Minister Nakasone's visit to the United States. He described the idea of creating space weapons as deterrence and protection. Subsequent events have shown that these words were not just a compliance for the international project. The whole of the past period in Japan has been marked by a powerful propaganda campaign to favor of controlling the matter in U.S. Practical steps aimed at the same time have also been implemented. These include first and foremost the agreement concluded with the United States on limiting their military technology. In great Japanese, too, have been the steps to the representative alliance which have created Strategic Defense Initiative where the development (transfer) of space weapons is carried out.

With these measures, various practical approach, the Japanese do not intend the activities related their interest in getting Japan involved in their dangerous venture. In fact Japan Tokyo as the cheapest supplier. First, the United States, defense secretary, and Nakasone, the head of the "war zone" program, finally said yesterday it was done up. But what advantages will Japan get from this?

In working on public opinion the U.S. supporters have placed the main emphasis on the fact that participation in it is a natural exercise in easing the trade restrictions with the United States, and that this will supposedly benefit a powerful impulse for the development of advanced technology in Japan itself, leading ultimately to the strengthening of the position as a power with worldwide influence.

But the example of Japan itself places these arguments in doubt. For it is not difficult to see that it was the war zone reflects and merged in the first line of

scientific and technical progress, education, in fact, and thus the science of economics should concentrate on the new concepts raised by these very scientific questions, in the interest of the world community. In the perspective of the United Nations project, given, not in practice, but in fact, and not in being in various respects.

There are also being considered. Considerations are being made for getting around that there is more than one way of going to get things done, and that we must be able to make the use of various things, in relation to the government. We will attempt a wide range of research that is not connected to national security, and as possible future work in the program will be a reflection of the economic principles. It has been declared that these principles remain with the position of the member and its own functioning aimed at separate members, and that we should not be divided.

It is not clear that our members. The facts stated in August. The new concept of "open world" is based primarily on the various steps, and it is not clear that we have built the conceptual, organizational and other important relationships. This means that we have gone beyond understanding the use of space for peaceful purposes and building the concept of arms - the new world principles that are existing, and that we have in the world, and are just members, but ourselves. It is not clear that we are the future type of being able to make trade relationships to the United Nations.

1960

1960 1960/1960

JPRS-TAC-66-16
10 April 1966

THE NEW YORK TIMES

CHINESE PRESS ADVANCES COMMUNIST AGENDAS ON S.S.

Reporting Source in Japanese for Japan (S.S.) 25 Nov 65

(High Priority - collection)

(Coverage) The Chinese Press of Japan has raised the opposition to the U.S. space discrimination plan, known known as the star war plan. In this connection, Chinese Press comments (high priority) under the following manner:

The refusal to participate in the realization of the S.S. — through Chinese intelligence — plan, announced by this authoritative organization of Japanese education, and a reaction to the increasingly persistent strategy of Tokyo's official authorities to draw Japan into the realization of the star war plan, which is dangerous to the cause of peace.

According to Chinese Press, Japanese is going to lay a heavy financial burden for the realization of S.S. in Japan and other allies. This was disclosed in an interview with (Chinese Press), president and one of the advocates of the realization of star war, who is active in the S.S. group. (Chinese Press) statement corroborates the fact that the Japanese — the U.S. defense government — intends to devote a colossal amount of Japanese high technology and capital. It also expresses the apprehension manifested by Japanese scientific and technical circles, which are worried that they may not be given anything in return. The most important thing is that the military opposition star war plan will not bring any benefit to the interests of either the United States or its allies.

According to a recent opinion poll conducted among Japanese physicians, a majority believes that the realization of S.S. will lead to an expansion of nuclear armament.

Japanese education shows their belief, and the statement by the Science Council of Japan declares that Japanese education, also represents a nation which experienced the tragedy of atomic-bomb attacks. That is responsible to help the star war plan.

There is an alternative to the dangerous star war plan. It is the Soviet Union's constructive and rational proposal, calling for cooperation to the peaceful development of space and the use of the gains in this sphere for the well-being of all mankind.

(916)

CRT: 5200/1110

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR COL GEN CHERVOV INTERVIEW CRITICIZES EUROPEAN SDI

AD270408 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 21 Mar 86 p 6

[Interview with USSR Colonel General N. Chervov by APN military commentator V. Morozov; "The Dangerous Nature of the European Variant of the So-Called Strategic Defense Initiative. The Threat of Increased Tension in Europe"--date and place not given; initial paragraph is paper's introduction]

[Text] The idea of creating a West European antimissile defense has been of late actively assessed [pouchduje] on the pages of the West European countries' press.

High-ranking NATO generals -- B. Rogers, W. Kerner, and W. Altenburg -- have already spoken on that theme. At the request of the NOVOSTI military commentator V. Morozov, prominent Soviet military-political expert Colonel General N. Chervov takes a stance on some questions mentioned in an interview by B. Rogers, commander in chief of the NATO Armed Forces in Europe (in the SVET DNEPRIVKED [LITUR] newspaper) and W. Altenburg, general inspector of the FRG Bundeswehr (in DER SPIEGEL magazine).

[Morozov] What can be said about the B. Rogers' and W. Altenburg's statements about the idea of a European variant of the American Strategic Defense Initiative -- the "European Defense Initiative"?

[Chervov] Such propagation of a new "idea" deliberately confuses people. What is involved here is not at all the undermining of the air defense system. The NATO bloc announces the creation of a variant of a West European antimissile defense. Rogers openly says that Western Europe is allegedly not to wait for some sort of a "spinoff" ["odpad"] or "secondary raw materials" of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, but must itself create a corresponding antimissile system. Altenburg, too, sings the same song.

What will it lead to? To a further arms buildup, of course. DER SPIEGEL magazine notes that the "West and East will arrive at the new equilibrium of fear, but on a substantially more complicated level and by expending much greater resources." It would seem that such a prospect of the realization of the plan of the Strategic Defense Initiative is, on the whole, clear. However, Altenburg turns everything upside down and asserts that "this does not at all have to become a new round of feverish arms buildup, ... but if you want to, there are incentives for disarmament ... this is an absolutely new moment in thinking." This is a strange animal! Such myths are refuted by reality. After

all, one envisages the development and production of new weapons, and this -- in a normal human language -- is called feverish arms buildup.

One cannot run away from the truth and pretend that creating new antimissile weapons according to the variant of the so-called European Defense Initiative are a "blessing" for Western Europe. When we look the truth in the eye, fomenting a feverish arms buildup in yet another respect would increase tension in Europe and lead to the growth of the threat of war. Strengthening the security of Western Europe should not be sought along the line of the so-called American Strategic Defense Initiative and European Defense Initiative, but along the line of a complete liquidation of nuclear weapons on earth, along the line of ridding the European Continent of nuclear and chemical weapons. The proposals submitted by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his statement of 15 January 1986 are opening realistic possibilities for a successful course in that respect.

[Morozov] General Rogers speaks about U.S. "restraint" within the framework of the program of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative which, allegedly, is restricted to research only. What can be said in this connection?

[Chervov] In this respect, Mr Rogers has forgotten two things: The first one is his own statement in the French magazine SCIENCE ET VIE (October 1985) that in the U.S. "star wars" program, "any restraint or lagging behind the USSR did not and does not exist." To prove it, he submits these facts: "When I was the Army's chief of staff, all scientific research work in the sphere of antimissile defense was subordinated to me...We received the order: A. to speed up scientific research work so as to prevent the Russians from achieving superiority; B. to develop a prototype and test it."

"In 1979, when I left that post in connection with the transfer to NATO, we achieved such success that, as it was envisaged, we could stop one fired bullet with the help of another fired bullet." Further, Rogers openly states that the United States has never halted research in the sphere of antimissile defense and has not limited it, that the work has continued at full speed also after the signing of the agreement on antimissile defense in 1972. "The Strategic Defense Initiative," Rogers says, "is not something new that has just been invented; it is already an old idea."

That is the way it is -- in black and white. Washington officials blather about the "restraint" of the United States, and he, Rogers, refutes everything. "That is cheap propaganda," he said in October 1985. It is not clear why Rogers has now made a 180-degree turn and has also begun speaking about "restraint," by which he refutes his own words.

The second circumstance is the existing situation. Rogers obviously knows that the Strategic Defense Initiative ranks in the Pentagon among those military strategic programs (with the MX ICBMs, the ballistic missiles on submarines of the Trident system, and the strategic B-1B bombers) having highest priority. The administration's budget documents state openly that the United States, regardless of the course of the Geneva talks and the USSR's standpoint on that issue, will continue all the way to the full development and deployment of the antimissile defense with elements of space bases. The real intentions of the U.S. Administration to accelerate the work on the Strategic Defense Initiative are attested to by the billions of dollars requested for it. For example, for the 1987 fiscal year, the Pentagon alone requests for the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative \$4.8 billion (75 percent more than in the current fiscal year).

The greatest part of the work within the framework of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative is in the stage of experiments and construction of demonstration models for carrying out tests. This activity is at variance with the spirit of the agreement on antimissile defense, and some of them (the tests of an X-ray laser outside the polygons [polygons] of antimissile defense) are at direct variance with the 1972 agreement.

In the work for the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative the main U.S. military-industrial companies, universities, laboratories of leading firms, as well as private research organizations participate. Could one imagine the United States spending (in 5 years) \$26 billion on research to later abandon the idea of "star wars" only because "the Russians will be against their deployment"? It is also ridiculous to think that \$26 billion would be earmarked only to resolve a theoretical question whether it is or it is not possible to develop offensive space devices. Weinberger comments on it openly: "I exclude the possibility of relinquishing strategic defense, be it at the research stage or at the deployment stage." The U.S. President himself declared on 7 February 1986 that he will do everything he can for the continuation of research and tests within the framework of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative.

Mr Rogers obviously knows all this. Therefore it is not clear why it was necessary to mix up everything like that. Perhaps he has received the order from Washington to rehabilitate himself somehow for the statements in SCIENCE ET VIE. Or his task was to help the U.S. Administration to more cleverly circumvent the new Soviet initiatives which propose to Europe and all people not "star wars," but a world without nuclear weapons.

[Morozov] According to Rogers' view, in case the East and the West would succeed in creating effective defense systems, that is, their own "space shields," "general tranquility" would prevail and none of the sides would need nuclear weapons. What is your opinion?

[Chervov] A simultaneous creation of "space shields" in the East and West will lead to a very unstable, critical situation. The following is involved:

If one of the sides deploys offensive and defensive systems, and the other has only offensive, in that case the first one gains a marked strategic superiority and the possibility of launching a disarming nuclear strike. In such a situation the reduction of strategic offensive weapons loses sense for the other side. It must perfect and develop them in order to maintain the possibility to renew the strategic equilibrium. This is the elementary logic of nuclear counterweight, based on the objectively existing interdependence of offensive and defensive strategic systems.

But also if the two sides had offensive and defensive systems the situation would be worse than if the two sides had only offensive weapons. Calculations reveal that at a minimum, very small advantages of one of the sides in the effectiveness of its defensive system immediately destabilize the entire situation. Such a situation exists also when the level of offensive weapons is markedly reduced. In other words, with both sides having "space shields," reductions of strategic offensive systems lose their value, because such reduction will no longer guarantee the stability of the situation to the sides, particularly when one of the sides clearly wants to gain superiority in defensive systems, such as the United States does it now.

At a press conference in Geneva, M. Gorbachev presented an original example of a situation when both sides have "space shields": "Imagine what the consequences of even a coincidental collision in outer space would be. Let us say that something has separated from a rocket, its warhead of the rocket booster would tear off and collide with a grouping of these space weapons. Signals will be sent, and all this can be interpreted as the other side's attempt to destroy these weapons. Computers go into action, and in such a case politicians cannot do anything sensible. And we will become slaves to these events."

We know the tragic fate of the Challenger space shuttle. If that were to happen with the two sides' "space shields" in existence, the computers of the American "space shields" would begin working immediately. And how would it end?

A joint deployment of "space shields" -- that is a deceptive course, which creates the illusion of strengthening the security of the sides, but in reality undermines it. The USSR favors a radical reduction of nuclear weapons, but without deploying extensive systems of antimissile defense and without developing offensive space weapons. Only such a course can lead to the total liquidation of nuclear weapons and the stabilization of the situation.

/9365

CSO: 5200/1318

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

WASHINGTON ENVOY BRIEFS NAKASONE ON SDI PROGRAM

OW250101 Tokyo KYODO in English 0053 GMT 25 Mar 86

[Text] Tokyo, March 25 KYODO--Japanese Ambassador to Washington Nobuo Matsunaga has told Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone that the United States is anxious for a decision by Japan on whether it will participate in the star wars research program. Matsunaga is in Tokyo to prepare for Nakasone's visit to the U.S. starting April 12.

The envoy called on Nakasone Monday night and said, according to officials, that while Washington understands that Tokyo's participation in Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) research is a matter for Japan to decide by itself, and that an SDI study mission is now in the U.S., the U.S. Government thinks that "the sooner the decision, the better."

The U.S. Government says that Japanese participation in the SDI would give the U.S. more bargaining power in negotiations with the Soviet Union, the ambassador reportedly told Nakasone.

A study mission consisting of both government officials and business representatives is in the U.S. to study the feasibility of Japanese firms participating in the research program into the space-based defense system.

The envoy also reported to Nakasone that protectionist sentiment still prevails in the U.S. Congress over the country's trade deficit with Japan.

The trade friction is expected to feature prominently in Nakasone's talks with President Ronald Reagan in Washington.

/6091

CSO: 5260/063

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

ABE: SDI PARTICIPATION NOT NAKASONE'S DECISION ALONE

OW291417 Tokyo NHK Television Network in Japanese 1200 GMT 27 Mar 86

[Text] At a session of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Councilors held today, Foreign Minister Abe stated that the issue of participation in SDI -- Strategic Defense Initiative -- research is not one that can be unilaterally decided by Prime Minister Nakasone.

In his reply to a question by Mr Yutaka Hata of the DSP, Foreign Minister Abe said that the Japanese Government would not state its decision on SDI research participation during Prime Minister Nakasone's visit to the United States, scheduled for next month. He added that this issue could not be unilaterally decided by Prime Minister Nakasone, and that proper procedures should be carefully followed in dealing with it. The decision should be based on a report, to be submitted by a study group leaving for the United States soon, and, if necessary, consultations should be held among Cabinet members concerned with the issue.

/6091

CSO: 5260/065

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

JAPANESE EXPERTS MISSION LEAVES FOR SDI TALKS IN U.S.

OM290937 Tokyo KYODO in English 0854 GMT 29 Mar 86

[Text] Tokyo, March 29 KYODO -- A large Japanese mission comprising 46 technical experts from 21 companies left Tokyo for Washington Saturday on a mission to explore the possibility of Japan's participation in research on the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). The group, which also includes government officials, will be briefed on the space-based antimissile project, known as the "Star Wars" program, by officials at the SDI Bureau of the Defense Department Monday.

The mission will split up into three groups to visit research institutions and enterprises throughout the U.S. It is the third such mission to be sent to the United States by Japan.

The government has said it will decide whether to take part in the research project after receiving a report by the mission.

U.S. Defense Secretary Casper Weinberger has urged the Japanese government to decide to participate in the program as soon as possible.

The mission, which will stay in the United States until April 9, will submit an interim report to Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone before he leaves for Washington on April 12.

Private enterprises taking part in the mission included major electronics companies such as Hitachi Ltd., Toshiba Corp., Sony Corp., Fujitsu Ltd., Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, and high-technology firms related to the aviation industry.

The mission also includes representatives from the Foreign Ministry, the Defense Agency and the Ministry of International Trade and Industry.

After an inspection tour, the officials are scheduled to return to Washington for working-level consultations with their American counterparts.

/6091

CSO: 5260/068

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

REF ID: A66456
10 APR 1988

JAPAN: KOMIITO'S TAKEIRI COMMENTS ON TRADE (IS-H, 02)

ONC09043 Tokyo KYODU in English 0911 007 19 Mar 88

(Text) Tokyo, March 18 KYODU—Komeito Chairman Yoshinobu Takeiri called Friday for expansion of domestic demand to diffuse trade disputes stemming from Japan's huge trade surplus. The leader of Japan's second largest opposition party summed up to reporters his 11-day visit to the United States earlier this month.

U.S. Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige urged Japan to map out a clear import promotion plan similar to its export drives in the past, he said. Protectionist and market-opening pressures appeared to have eased in the U.S., yet they are there "under the water," Takeiri said. Americans are dissatisfied with Japan's slow efforts to correct trade imbalance, he added.

Takeiri, chairman of Komeito for the past 39 years, made an official visit to the U.S. March 1-11, his first visit to that country in 14 years. During the visit, he met Vice President George Bush, Secretary of State George Shultz, Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger and U.S. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar. The visit was useful but made him feel Komeito should send a mission to the U.S. at least once a year to keep up-to-date on the U.S. situation, Takeiri said.

In the press meeting at the Japan National Press Club, Takeiri said Americans explained about the technical aspect of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) and over-the-horizon (OTH) radar which the Japanese Government plans to deploy.

He denied reports that he had become positive about SDI after the U.S. visit.

Komeito should not change its basic prudent attitude regarding SDI, Takeiri said.

/6091

CSO: 5260/066

SECRET
10 April 1985

SECRET

SECRET

SECRET

["Secret Defense Statement"]—(S) (U) (C) (E) (F) (G) (H) (I) (J) (K) (L) (M) (N) (O) (P) (Q) (R) (S) (T) (U) (V) (W) (X) (Y) (Z)

[Text] (as detailed as possible) — The 1985 Defense Law states a statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Italy over the decision taken by the Italian Government to allow Italian companies to participate in the implementation of the 1972 program. This step, the statement says, not only is aimed at the gradual deepening of Italy's role in the implementation of the E.S. plan to eliminate nuclear arms. The Italian Government cannot help realizing that the fulfillment of these plans, aimed at broadening the existing military-strategic parity and achieving military superiority over the USSR, is bound to protect the area over which it is bound to exercise the strategic authority, and also that it contributes to the preservation of the 1972 Treaty concluded in perpetuity (as recalled) in 1972 and constituting the foundation of the process of the limitation and reduction of nuclear armaments.

The above-stated action by the Italian Government obviously has resulted in the renewed assurance about readiness to promote the ending of the arms race, the lowering of the level of military confrontation in the world and in Europe, and to facilitate the successful progress and positive completion of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on nuclear and space arms. Surely do these talks also align with the Italian Government's statement in favor of strict observance of the 1972 SALT Treaty. The present world situation is, the world, as it was stressed in the statement, calls for urgent efforts to prevent the spreading of the arms race to outer space and back to the earth, and each country should display a heightened sense of responsibility as regards the practical steps and decisions.

The hope was expressed that the Italian Government would display a positive attitude on this statement and draw conclusions really testifying to Italy's adherence to the cause of limiting and reducing nuclear arms and preventing an arms race in outer space. Such a position would fully accord with the vital interests of all states in Europe, Italy included.

/985

CSO: 5200/1310

Wang, J. & Wu, Y.

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26

[illegible]

10. Further, while the time that is used in connection with general business matters may vary, the time that is used in connection with the business of the firm is not used in connection with the business of the firm.

The following has been furnished to the staff of the State Department in order to assist in the review of the proposed program. The staff of the State Department is currently reviewing the proposed program and is expected to complete its review by the end of the month. The staff of the State Department is currently reviewing the proposed program and is expected to complete its review by the end of the month.

The following is a summary of the proposed program. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month.

Summary of the proposed program

The following is a summary of the proposed program. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month.

The following is a summary of the proposed program. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month.

The following is a summary of the proposed program. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month.

The following is a summary of the proposed program. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month.

Summary of the proposed program

The following is a summary of the proposed program. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month.

The following is a summary of the proposed program. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month.

The following is a summary of the proposed program. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month.

The following is a summary of the proposed program. The program is expected to be completed by the end of the month.

0-0-4558 000000 1463

THE ANALYSIS OF THE SITUATION IN THE AREA OF NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

Source: *SOVIET PRESS* in Russian 18 Jan 86 p. 3

[Article: "Soviet's appeal"]

[Text] The year 1986 has already entered into history. It has entered as the year of proclamation by the Soviet Union of a program of total liquidation of nuclear weapons in the entire world. This program, presented in the announcement of CPSU Central Committee Secretary General N. S. Gorbachev, provides for the implementation and completion in three stages of the process of freeing the Earth from nuclear weapons in the next 15 years, before the end of this century.

Back in the time of the atomic era, the Soviet Union proposed an agreement on general and total disarmament, so as to channel atomic energy exclusively toward peaceful and constructive purposes. The 40-some post-war years have shown that mankind, which has lived these years without a major war, nevertheless cannot be sure about its future as long as nuclear armaments are being stockpiled and developed. No more different proposals the Soviet Union has submitted during all these years in order to save the planet which is being carried away into the nuclear abyss by an avalanche of armament. These proposals were for the most part rejected, while the dangerous slippage into world-wide conflagration continues. A new threat has begun to hang over the Earth—a threat from space, which the USA wants to turn into a proving ground and base for "star wars."

And in this critical moment in the time of mankind, Moscow once again issued the appeal to the countries of the West and particularly the USA to stop and think, to rise above old differences in the name of salvation of the planet, to finally begin the practical liquidation of the nuclear armaments. Thus, there is the West who has so many of powerful weapons, but who are spending in tremendous amounts still more time enlarging the decisive test: are they ready to respond to the proposal of the USSR and to the rest of the foreign policy community?

The Soviet foreign policy has proclaimed the correct way to be the international law of peace. This is not merely a formal act. It is a major action which obligates us to very much. It obligates us to participate in the military activity of nations, to an active search for means of reducing international tensions and to improving the situation on our planet, to cooperation

in fair regulation in the "hot spots"--in the Near East, Central America, near Afghanistan, in South Africa and the area of the Persian Gulf; and to a rejection of everything which might complicate an already difficult international situation and to cut off at the root the shoots of mutual understanding and trust which are again sprouting on the rocky soil of confrontation.

The New Year's addresses by M. S. Gorbachev to the American people and of R. Reagan to the Soviet people were good omens for the Year of Peace. Let us take upon ourselves the task of doing away with the threat which hangs over mankind, said the Soviet leader. Let us work together to make this year a Year of Peace, said the American leader. It is important when the announcements of state leaders who embody opposite worlds resound in unison. The problem consists of their also acting in unison when it comes to strengthening mutual peace and international security. The Year of Peace is not only a year for declaration of good intentions. It is primarily a year of practical actions which would bring the international community closer to stopping the arms race and eliminating nuclear weapons, as currently proposed in the Announcement of M. S. Gorbachev. Whether or not the year 1986 will be entered into the post-war chronicle with a positive balance and what evaluation it will receive from world public opinion will depend on whether or not such actions will be taken and whether the "spirit of Geneva" will attain material realization.

The possibilities and chances are evident. They are perhaps the most favorable in recent years, after the impressive achievements in the politics of relaxation of tensions of the 70's. On the threshold of the International Year of Peace, which requires of every state a manifestation of good will and support of the good will of other participants in the world community, we must remind ourselves of these chances.

--The USSR has taken the promise of not being the first to use nuclear weapons.

--The USSR has rejected the concept of placing anti-satellite weapons into space, proposing to the USA that it completely cease on a mutual basis all practical work on the development of anti-satellite systems;

--The USSR has removed from combat readiness in its European section the SS-20 missiles which were additionally deployed in response to the placement of American medium range missiles on the European flank of NATO.

--The USSR has introduced a moratorium on any nuclear blasts, and now, when its time has elapsed, has extended it for another 3 months in the hopes that the USA and other nuclear powers will join in this decision.

All these actions have been taken UNILATERALLY. All of them are a clear testimony to the politics of GOOD EXAMPLE. All of them are supported by world public opinion. Years have passed since some of them, and since others--months. In this time, many decisions have been made in Washington, but not one of them has indicated a desire to take the hand extended by the Soviet Union. Streams of peace-loving rhetoric pour out of the official Washington tribunes, but in them it is futile to seek a positive response to the manifestation of good will

by Moscow or to its constructive signals. Instead, Washington continues to insist on the "right" to a first nuclear strike, makes deals with its NATO allies for the realization of the "star wars" project, builds up its nuclear missile groupings in Western Europe, and continues its nuclear experiments.

After the meeting in Geneva, the Soviet Union dismantled, as it had promised, the stationary SS-20 missile installations in its European section. After Geneva, the USSR informed the U.S. government of its readiness to take the most decisive steps in regard to control over the cessation of nuclear testing--up to on-site checks. After Geneva, the USSR proposed a specific program for ridding mankind of nuclear weapons and nuclear war, and of the fear of it. This was a program for building a system of reliably guaranteed general security. And what has happened in Washington? Alas, after the summit meeting, essentially nothing has been done there which would evidence the decisiveness to act "in the spirit of Geneva." Not one practical step has been taken there in the sphere of security which would correspond to the agreements reached in Geneva.

The support of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear blasts might have been such a practical step, and might have allowed the year 1986 to enter into history as the year of the start of practical curtailment of the nuclear arms race.

The representatives of the Washington administration and certain NATO leaders who reject the appeals by Moscow to transform the peace-loving declarations into the plane of practical policy do not sit idly by. Thus, the U.S. Secretary of State G. Schultz goes to Europe, where with the sweat of his brow he drives wedges into the socialist alliance and shakes his fist at the political-territorial realities of the continent...

Pentagon emissary Dov [Zachaym] goes to NATO staff headquarters in Brussels, in order to announce there that "the European NATO countries should not expect the possibility of reducing their financial efforts in the sphere of defense, even if agreements on the reduction of strategic arsenals are reached in Geneva between the Soviet and American sides." This is how it is... Let them take their example from America, where the White House is asking Congress for "multi-billion dollar allocations to the Pentagon with a simultaneous reduction in numerous domestic programs." Instead of lightening the burden of military expenditures on the NATO allies, a new load is being placed on them--a large increase in the non-nuclear potential in the year 1986...

In Bonn, London and several other capitals of NATO countries they are adapting to Washington's militaristic steps. They are arming themselves to the teeth and striving toward military supremacy. In essence they are falling into adventurism by beginning the arms race in space. They are weaving intrigues against the socialist world, against independent developing countries, and particularly these days against Libya. Yet all the while they are giving cheerful assurances, as does the Bonn Chancellor H. Kohl, that "the ice age is not approaching." It is approaching if they turn matters toward this, if they reject everything rational and constructive which the Soviet Union and its socialist allies propose. It is approaching if they cast their well-substantiated caution to the winds--particularly in regard to the "star wars" program.

Whoever now builds the bunkers of the "cold war" will have to take the responsibility if another "ice age" ensues to replace the warming trend, and the "spirit of Geneva" evaporates.

Some people in the West act as if the U.N. decision on proclaiming 1986 to be the International Year does not apply to them. They do not want this year to become the landmark of true progress on the road to real disarmament and to the creation of a world without weapons or wars. Well, the upcoming months will show whether they are ready in Washington and in the capitals of the other NATO countries to follow the route laid out in Geneva, whether they are ready to confirm their proclaimed peaceful intentions with actions, and whether they are ready to begin the realization of the program of eliminating the nuclear arsenals together with the Soviet Union. Whether or not such readiness will be manifested determines to a large degree whether 1986 will become the year of a real breakthrough toward the better in European and world affairs, or whether it will remain a year of missed chances and unused opportunities.

The Soviet Union hopes that this Year of Peace leads to a peaceful decade and that mankind will enter the 21st century without nuclear weapons and under conditions of peace, trust and cooperation. If this same approach becomes dominant also in the West, the warming trend which has begun will turn into healthful, clear and stable world weather.

12322

CSO: 5200/1248

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET MAJ GEN MONIN ON GORBACHEV'S 15 JANUARY INITIATIVE

Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jan 86 p 3

[Article by Major General M. Monin, doctor of historical sciences: "In the Interests of All Mankind: Soviet Union Proposes Entering the Third Millenium Without Nuclear Weapons"]

[Text] The outline of the new edition of the CPSU Program states that "the peace-loving foreign policy course developed by the party and continuously implemented by the Soviet state, in combination with the strengthening of the country's defense capability, has ensured for the Soviet people and for most of the planet's population a peaceful life for the duration of the longest period in the 20th century." These words have a deep significance. The Leninist party, being internationalist in its character, directs its activity in the protection of peace and security not only in the interests of the Soviet people, but also in the interests of most of mankind. In this endeavor it encounters the approval and active support not only on the part of the states in the socialist alliance and the world communist movement, but also on the part of the broad popular masses in many countries of the world.

Such approval was clearly manifested in the great interest evoked throughout the entire world by the Statement of CPSU Central Committee Secretary General M. S. Gorbachev, which presents a set of new major foreign policy initiatives. This is a landmark document in the struggle of the Leninist party and the Soviet state for a strong and general peace. The Soviet Union has proposed a specific program of total and comprehensive liquidation of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, the liberation of mankind from the threat of self annihilation, and the provision of reliable security for the present and the coming generations on earth.

Today mankind has no other choice than that between survival and total destruction. The matter has come down to such a limit which requires the greatest sanity and thought in solving problems which touch upon the interests of every people, as well as all peoples together.

The unlimited arms race which is being stepped up by the imperialist countries, and primarily the United States of America, has led to the emergence of a real threat to the very existence of peaceful civilization.

The declaration of entire regions of the world to be "zones of vital interests" of the USA, the development of more and more new military air and naval bases here with placement of nuclear missile weapons, the forced increase of first

strike American nuclear missiles in Western Europe, the intensive preparations for militarization of space in order for the USA to achieve military-strategic supremacy over the Soviet Union and other socialist countries—this is but a partial list of imperialist actions which have led to the emergence of an extremely alarming and volatile situation.

The USSR, acting in close cooperation with the other countries of the socialist alliance, takes a diametrically opposed position on the radical questions of ensuring peace and creating favorable conditions for the survival of all mankind. This position taken by our country is reflected in numerous party documents, and is formulated with all clarity in the outline of the new edition of the CPSU Program and the Announcement of CPSU Central Committee Secretary General M. S. Gorbachev.

The outline of the new edition of the CPSU Program provides for the elimination of the threat of world war and the achievement of general security and disarmament as one of the primary tasks in the sphere of foreign policy.

The outline of the new edition of the CPSU Program stresses that the CPSU will continuously strive toward the implementation of measures leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons, the cessation of production and liquidation of other types of weapons of mass destruction, the reduction of the armed forces of the states, and the freezing and reduction in the troops and armaments in the most explosively dangerous regions of the planet. The party of Soviet communists stands out in favor of adopting measures for strengthening mutual trust and reducing the risk of emergence of armed conflicts, including those resulting by accident. Only through this means is it possible to bring mankind closer to a situation where the threat of a nuclear catastrophe will no longer hang over the planet like the sword of Damocles. Of the major foreign policy actions of an essential character taken by the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet government, the primary one is directed toward eliminating this threat. This is a specific program of total liquidation of nuclear weapons in the entire world, calculated for a precisely defined period of time.

Today, millions of people throughout the world, including also in the USA, are coming to better understand the vital need for solving this problem. It is of primary importance that this understanding is reflected also in the joint Soviet-American announcement adopted at the Geneva Summit Meeting. The document unambiguously states that nuclear war must never be unleashed, and that there can be no victors in it. The catastrophic consequences which may ensue in the case of any conflict between the USSR and the USA are also acknowledged. This makes the task of preventing any war between them--nuclear or conventional--an extremely important one. The Soviet-American summit meeting laid the groundwork for bettering the international situation. However, these prerequisites cannot be realized by themselves. In order to transform them into practical actions capable of changing the political climate on the planet, the efforts of both sides are needed.

History has repeatedly proven that the Soviet Union is true to its word and to its policy of peace and counteraction against war. This truth is now confirmed

by a series of proposals intended to turn the development of international life away from the increasing of tensions to easing them, and, as M. S. Gorbachev announced in his New Year's address to the American people, to give mankind "a reliable prospect of peace, a prospect of entering the third millenium without fear."

The basic approach of the USSR and its friends to the problem of disarmament consists of the parties' being guided by the principle of equality and uniform security, without striving to strengthen their security by means of new types of weapons which thus disrupt the military-strategic parity between the USSR and the USA and between the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO.

It is specifically in this key that we should view the large-scale Soviet peace initiatives, which are supported by the countries of the socialist alliance. Added to the previously adopted responsibilities of not being the first to use nuclear weapons and not placing anti-satellite systems in space were the proposals on reducing by 50 percent the nuclear weapons currently existing in the USSR and the USA which are capable of reaching each other's territory. These were accompanied by a mandatory condition of total prohibition of the development of space strike weapons, and by the introduction of a moratorium on all types of nuclear tests. The Soviet state also declared a unilateral moratorium on the further placement of medium range missiles in Europe and on retaliatory measures connected with the placement of American first-strike missiles in the European zone. The CPSU and the Soviet government presented new and far-reaching initiatives on most of these problems. They were presented in the Announcement by M. S. Gorbachev. A major act of good will by the Soviet Union became the proposal on totally ridding mankind of nuclear weapons by the end of the 20th century, on liquidating all medium-range ballistic and cruise missiles by the USSR and the USA in the European zone as the first stage of reducing nuclear weapons, as well as on prolonging until 31 March 1986 the unilateral moratorium on any nuclear blasts, as well as other Soviet initiatives.

Thus, the set of new initiatives presented in the Announcement of the CPSU Central Committee Secretary General encompasses all the most important directions and spheres of activity in the interests of disarmament, restoration of trust, and strengthening of the prospects of a peaceful future and progress of all peoples. The matter now rests with the West.

In this connection, we cannot help but be concerned about the reports that the United States continues to press forward on work with the "star wars" program, whose realization would lead to strategic chaos and to a qualitatively new and uncontrolled stage in the arms race. The doctrine of "new globalism" recently proclaimed by Washington has once again shown that the imperialist circles in the USA, who continue to increase tension in the world, aspire to the role of some kind of "world judge" who has the fates of all peoples in his power.

This is why, as long as the danger exists of unleashing imperialist aggression, military conflicts and any type of provocations, the CPSU considers it necessary,

as stated in the outline of the new edition of its Program, for the "USSR Armed Forces to be at a level which would exclude the strategic supremacy of the imperialist forces, so that the defense capability of the Soviet state may be comprehensively developed and the combat cooperation of the armies of the fraternal socialist countries strengthened."

The USSR does not encroach on the security of any country--be it in the West or in the East. It threatens no one and does not strive to enter into conflict with any state. It wants to live in peace with all countries. Since the time of the Great October, the Soviet socialist state bears high the banner of peace and friendship between peoples. Maintaining their truth to this Leninist banner, the CPSU and the Soviet state, in close unity with the fraternal parties and states of the socialist alliance, will continue to strive toward betterment of the international situation and toward a comprehensive strengthening of peace in the name of security and well-being of all the peoples of our planet.

12322

CSO: 5200/1268

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

DUTCH ANALYST ON CONDITIONS IN GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 12 Mar 86 p 7

[Article by Dr J.G. Siccama, research associate at the Dutch Institute for International Relations "Clingendael" in The Hague: "Gorbachev's Proposal: Conditions Trouble Outlook For Accord"]

[Text] According to Gorbachev, the world can be free of nuclear weapons in the year 2000, an ideal that Reagan, too, had already embraced when he introduced his strategic defense plans in March 1983. Gorbachev, who divides the route to that year into three stages, gave priority to a nuclear weapon-free Europe. In the first phase, which would take between 5 and 8 years, medium-range nuclear weapons would be eliminated. Doesn't the withdrawal of SS-20's (on the Russian side) and Pershing-2's and Cruise missiles (on NATO's side) still mean acceding to the zero-zero option proposed by Reagan at the start of the INF negotiations in 1981?

In other points as well (prohibiting the possession of chemical weapons, conventional stability), breakthroughs in arms consultations seemed to be at hand, all the more so since Gorbachev has shown himself ready to accept on-site inspection. And optimism rose to even greater heights when the Soviet Union, in an explanation to the speech, made an accord on European medium-range nuclear weapons no longer dependent on a halt to the American SDI plans. What really still stood in the way of subscribing to the zero-zero option for medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, which would also eliminate the need to base Cruise missiles in the Netherlands?

Two Conditions

A careful reading of Gorbachev's text shows that the Soviet Union will only agree to such a zero-zero option if two conditions are fulfilled. In the first place, the United States must refrain from sending delivery systems to its allies and England and France have to renounce an 'expansion' of their nuclear armaments. In fact, this clause boils down to making it impossible for the United States to supply the British with Trident missiles and Cruise missiles. Furthermore, Moscow is trying to get the United States to bring the European countries with nuclear weapons under U.S. guardianship. Namely, the United States is supposed to see that France and England live up to a Russian demand concerning the armament of America's allies.

In the second place, Gorbachev couples the elimination of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe to the condition that the United States agree to a nuclear test ban. Literally, this condition, which incidentally has received scarcely any attention, reads: 'From the first, it is necessary that the Soviet Union and the United States agree to a halt to all nuclear tests and call upon other nations to join in this moratorium as quickly as possible.' Gorbachev opposes the reduction in nuclear weapons, not bound to a ban on all nuclear tests, proposed by Reagan. Without a test ban, according to him, nuclear weapons will continue to be further refined. Consequently, a ban on nuclear testing (bilateral and later multilateral) is a practical step towards moving away from nuclear weapons.

On this point, the Russian party leader doesn't shy away from threats. The moratorium that the Soviet Union had unilaterally imposed and that was originally supposed to last until 31 December 1985 has been extended 'one more time', namely until 31 March 1986. The Soviet Union cannot, however, 'continue to show restraint in making nuclear tests until the end of time.' In the absence of a positive American response to the one-sided Russian moratorium, the 'logic' of the arms race should have demanded that Moscow resume nuclear testing on 1 January. This is a last attempt to break through that 'logic'. If America again fails to respond positively, then 'the arms race will change into an avalanche in which any control over the course of events will become impossible.'

Grandiose Plans

In his response to Gorbachev's proposal of 24 February past, Reagan did not go into either of the two conditions named by the Russian party leader at all. Reagan did couple the elimination of medium-range missiles to the condition that this would apply not only to SS-20's, Cruise missiles and Pershing-2's in Europe (or in the 'European zone') but likewise to that part of Russian territory in Asia from which SS-20's are not in a position to reach Western Europe. This condition, whose goal is to prevent the threat from being shifted to Japan and China, was not altogether new. That was also the case with the demand that the elimination would also have to hold for 'other types of medium-range nuclear weapons.'

There is little doubt that this means, among other things, the SS-22 missiles with a range of about 900 km in the GDR and in Czechoslovakia, and that the United States set this extra condition at the instigation of the GDR, the Netherlands and other countries. But just as much as the other conditions for a zero-solution named by the United States (removal of imbalances in conventional arms, resolution of regional conflicts), these complicating circumstances make it less likely that this zero-zero solution will ever really be achieved.

The history of arms control consultation shows that grandiose plans like comprehensive and general (nuclear) disarmament and a total ban on nuclear testing often mask the unwillingness of the superpowers to reach genuine negotiated results. Progress is given preference over concrete and partial reductions.

Reagan's crusade against nuclear weapons, Gorbachev's hodge-podge of total (nuclear) disarmament, the 'real' zero-solution for Europe and Andropov's three-phase plan (1982) all awaken memories of the fruitless consultation of the fifties and the beginning of the sixties. This might indicate that a negotiated agreement on nuclear weapons at Geneva will be more difficult to achieve than many are inclined to think.

In any event, one hopes that the "avalanche" in the arms race predicted by Gorbachev will be less terrifying than the series of heavy nuclear tests with which Krushchev broke the moratorium that was in effect in 1961. Or will the Russians also drop the condition of a halt to nuclear testing?

12507/8918
CSO: 5200/2655

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS CITES SAARLAND MINISTER ON REMOVAL OF U.S. MISSILES

LD232222 Moscow TASS in English 2205 UNT 23 Mar 86

[Text] Bonn March 23 TASS--TASS correspondent Sergey Sosnovskiy reports:

If a Social Democratic government comes to power in Bonn as a result of Bundestag elections due to be held next year, it will withdraw the American first-strike Pershing-2 and cruise nuclear missiles from the FRG's territory. A statement to this effect has been made by Oskar Lafonten, prime minister of the government of Saarland, chairman of the SPD land organization in Saar. He was addressing a congress of his party's land organization in Saarbrücken. Oskar Lafonten, who headed Saar's land government last year, is one of the most consistent opponents of implementation of the notorious NATO nuclear missile decisions among the West German Social Democrats.

He has repeatedly protested against the turning of the FRG's territory into a launching pad for the death-bringing American first-strike nuclear missiles, took an active part in various actions by the peace champions. The anti-missile stand of the Saar Social Democrats has contributed in a considerable measure to a growth of their prestige among the population of the land and helped them with a comfortable victory over the CDU in the course of the land elections in 1985.

O. LaFonten also declared for completely freeing the FRG's territory from nuclear weapons in the future. He also declared for the FRG's withdrawal from the NATO's military wing, while preserving its membership in the political organization of the North Atlantic Community.

The statements by the prime minister of Saarland have caused a panic among the FRG's ruling circles. They were in a hurry to launch a propaganda campaign against the Social Democrats, ascribing them some "neutralist tendencies" and accusing them of "infidelity" to the North Atlantic Bloc.

/9365

CSO: 5200/1317

1974-03-14 10-45 AM 001.100 000000

1974-03-14 10-45 AM 001.100 000000

1974-03-14 10-45 AM 001.100 000000

(Commentary by Rudolf K. Schenck)

[Text] The West German Reporter (WDR) (WDR), citing U.S. sources, reports (WDR) on the Pershing II missiles — as was agreed upon in the December 1973 SALT talks — but the most first-strike nuclear missiles have already been retired (retired) in the territory. International affairs journalist Rudolf K. Schenck is at the direction.

In this case one simply cannot but expect the well-known Soviet that would be the most serious case. Thus, the first reports in the effect that the Soviet Union intended to introduce intermediate-range nuclear missiles into the USSR is a large quantity than was officially announced several years ago. In fact, one reported in the Western press that the Pershing II missiles had entered the USSR, or 100 Pershing II's had come off. For what are they concerned? The issue is this: question was given then by the West German Foreign Minister, the press bulletin of the Soviet Government, the Foreign Ministry of the USSR. It is reported that the Soviet Union nuclear missile arsenal would be reduced (reduced) in the USSR.

As facts testify, these predictions are being realized. In the U.S. that (U.S.) missile base in Michigan State. It was complete Pershing II's and other (U.S.) missile based the more. They can at any moment join the missiles which have already been retired (retired) in West Germany. Combined with the nuclear weapons (nuclear) reported (U.S.) the USSR, the new intermediate-range missiles take up an (U.S.) missile of new destruction weapons.

But Washington also considers this as insufficient. The (U.S.) staff, stated that the number of missiles retired (retired) in the USSR is far lower than the computed level of requirement.

Four years ago Washington publicly assured the West German that additional nuclear armaments for West Germany would be limited, in regard Pershing II's, or (U.S.) arms. Today it is a question of (U.S.). How can it be (U.S.) and the (U.S.) (U.S.)

/9165

CSO: 5200/1317

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

11

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

INTERSTATE-ARMED NUCLEAR TALKS

THE CURRENTS IN THE TALKS BETWEEN THE TWO SIDES

OFFICIALS FROM THE TWO SIDES TO THE TALKS IN THE TALKS

(The current situation) "The state of the U.S. Administration are not buttressed by Soviet Russia"

(The current situation) "The fourth round of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons ended in Moscow on Tuesday (4 March).

Following the meeting in Moscow between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, the peace-loving world public expressed the hope that at the negotiations the two sides would reach a specific accord for peace and disarmament. This has not happened, however.

On the one hand, the substance of the positions of the two sides is no secret. The Soviet Union position is open diplomacy, which encourages the broad support of the international public. The main propositions of the Soviet Union are also politically sound. In comparing the two sides, most commentators arrive at conclusions that are not in the United States' favor. The American proposals concerning strategic nuclear weapons, in particular, are inconsistent with the principle of equality and equal security. Their implementation would not mean a reduction, but an increase in the number of weapons in the United States in a matter of months. In regard to intermediate-range forces, the latest proposals of the U.S. Administration are confined, in fact, to maintenance of the status quo. "Zero option," which was responsible for the shortening of talks between the USSR and the United States in 1985, the only difference being that it is no accompanied by additional conditions and requirements that are not forward and later this action was also unacceptable.

As far as the substance of the disarmament of space is concerned, the Soviet Union has not as previously as all and no difference of requirements adopted in January 1985 and fulfilled in the joint statement by the participants in the Moscow summit. The Soviet Union has not been able to place outside of the "agreements" suggested. According to documents, this would be another great obstacle to progress of the talks.

On the other hand, the fourth round of the negotiations once again that the relevant countries show the good intentions of representatives of the U.S. Administration, however much it is necessary as well as known, are not buttressed by Soviet Russia. It seems to be hoped that during the course the Soviet Union will realize the equal necessity of the disarmament and an agreement in the principle of peace and disarmament and reaching the goal of further realization of disarmament. This is the only way.

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR MBFR DELEGATE NEYLAND VIEWS NEW BLOC PROPOSALS

FM271155 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No 12, 23 Mar 86 Signed to Press
18 Mar 86 p 5

[Article by Nikolay Neyland, member of the Soviet delegation at the Vienna talks: "12 Steps To Meet the West"]

[Text] In late February at the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe, the socialist countries undertook an important new initiative.

The GDR delegation, on behalf of the GDR, Poland, the USSR, and the CSSR, submitted a detailed draft "agreement on an initial reduction of ground forces and armaments by the Soviet Union and the United States with a subsequent nonincrease in the levels of the sides' armed forces and armaments and related measures in central Europe." The Warsaw Pact states' desire to achieve a positive change at the talks was reaffirmed. What characterizes the submitted draft?

The new proposals, while preserving all the fundamental provisions contained in the socialist countries' 14 February 1985 proposals, greatly develop them, add detail, and supplement them. The new draft considers those elements of the West's position set forth 5 December last year which are acceptable.

Speaking in Vienna, V. Nikheylov, the leader of the Soviet delegation at the talks, noted the 12 points on which the socialist countries took steps to bring the positions closer. They essentially extend to all the main fields of a possible accord: the reduction of Soviet and U.S. troops, the provision on verification [kontrol], and others.

Taking into account the West's position, the socialist countries agreed on reduced ceilings for the initial reductions of troops of the USSR and United States and also with the West's proposed 3-year deadline for a subsequent freeze. They provide in their agreement for the establishment, for the entire period of its operation, of joint points for monitoring the exit and entrance of troops from the region or the region of the reductions, the possibility of undertaking on-site verification (proverka) following a justified request, the creation of a consultative commission, and the exchange of information on troops coming under the operation of the nonincrease undertaking, and other points.

The USSR representatives assert frequently but unfoundedly that the achievement of progress at the talks is impeded by the Warsaw Pact countries' reluctance to agree on certification measures. It is now obvious that that is by no means the point. The

socialist countries stand and have stood for sensible verification according with the content and point of disarmament measures.

And so a new step has been taken at the Vienna talks, bearing witness to the Warsaw Pact countries' possession of the political will not only to move the protracted talks from a standstill but also to lay a practical foundation to agreed reductions of conventional armed forces. All this refutes the militarists' phony arguments that the abolition of nuclear weapons will leave the West "defenseless" in the face of "Soviet military superiority."

Several weeks have elapsed since the new initiative was put forward and time has shown that the Western participants in the talks are unfortunately continuing to impose on the Warsaw Pact countries terms for the agreement which would put them at a disadvantage compared to the NATO countries.

How else is it possible to assess the Western participants' persistent attempts to unjustifiably extend verification measures beyond the framework of the agreed region of central Europe, that is to the territory of the Soviet Union, which fundamentally contradicts the very mandate of the Vienna talks? The Western participants are seeking to minimize the real reductions of armed forces and are refusing to resolve the question of arms reduction and at the same time are arbitrarily increasing and complicating their demands for verification and taking them to the point of absurdity, as though this was the main aim of the talks, and not the reduction of military antagonism in central Europe. The Vienna talks are not taking place in a vacuum, they are an important part of the overall process of talks to halt the arms race and of the consolidation of trust between states. "The main thing here," as M.S. Gorbachev said at the 27th CPSU Congress, "is to bring matters to a mutually acceptable balance of interests."

/9365

CSO: 5200/1316

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

CSSR DAILY CRITICIZES NATO VERIFICATION DEMANDS

AU191507 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 11 Mar 86 p 6

/Article by Josef Sestak, deputy head of the Czechoslovak mission to the United Nations in Vienna: "Realistic Concept of the Socialist Countries: Public Demands Concrete Results"/

/Text/ More than a year ago, the member-states of the Warsaw Pact--participants in the Vienna talks on the Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions in central Europe, submitted a significant proposal, with which they paved the way for a sensible compromise at this historically longest-lasting disarmament forum. In the interest of speedily achieving first concrete and tangible results, they proposed concentrating attention on effecting the first two steps: 1) an initial symbolic reduction of the USSR and the U.S. ground troops, together with their equipment and combat technology (20,000 troops on the USSR side and 13,000 troops on the U.S. side); 2) a consecutive nonincrease of the level of armed forces and equipment of all 11 direct participants in the talks. This practical project was submitted in Vienna on 14 February 1985 in the form of a draft of basic stipulations of an agreement with the proviso that it be fully opened for a constructive and pragmatic discussion. Its greatest advantage was that it soberly and realistically reacted to a more than a decade-long impasse at the talks, and offered a real /realne/ way out of the situation.

Since the socialist countries submitted the aforementioned proposal, they have not missed a single opportunity to draw NATO's attention to the immense military and political significance which the achievement of the first agreement in Vienna has yielded. Be it the Sofia session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact, Mikhail Gorbachev's speech to the French Parliament last October, or the 27th CPSU Congress, they all reminded one that in Vienna there lies a topical and viable proposal of the socialist countries. One can positively assess the fact that under the influence of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva, the NATO states--in their reply on 5 December 1985--accepted the idea of a partial agreement proposed by the socialist countries, as well as the timetable of the first 2 years--the initial symbolic Soviet-American reduction and the consequent nonincrease of the levels of troops and armaments by the direct participants in the talks. For the first time in many years a situation was created at the Vienna talks which makes it possible for both sides to fully concentrate their attention on the two

groups of issues which are to be the foundation of the future agreement. At the same time, however, it is necessary to note that the Western response is marked by a number of imbalanced /nevyvazene/ and unrealistic elements that create obstacles in the path of accelerated progress.

In the NATO's response of 5 December 1985, the resolution of the equipment issue is at variance with the mandate of the Vienna talks. According to the Western view, a symbolic contingent of USSR and U.S. troops without their equipment should be withdrawn, and the freeze as well should concern only troops, a matter that would leave the "door open" for the continuation of the feverish stockpiling of new and ever more destructive weapons in central Europe.

However, the most topical negative feature of the Western response is the endeavor to replace the agreement on the process of the reduction of the level of military confrontation with an "agreement on verification." The NATO states, as if obsessed by the fetish of verification, would like to fill the fairly simple agreement on the realization of the first steps by a blownup "packet" of verification measures, with which they came to Vienna as early as 1979.

The objective of the verification measures of the partial agreement, which is being discussed in Vienna now, logically and in accordance with the agreed principle of the preservation of the security of both sides, namely, would have to be: a. the verification of whether the USSR and the United States withdrew the agreed symbolic contingents of their ground troops and equipment; b. the verification of whether the seven NATO states and the four Warsaw Pact states--direct participants in the talks--in the course of the agreed freeze period do not violate that pledge and do not increase the existing number of their troops and equipment in the central European region.

The socialist countries are interested in a reliable and strict verification of the fulfillment of the agreed commitments. They are not interested in anything less, but not in anything more either. They propose concrete, sensible, and substantiated verification measures that respect the principles of equality, equal security, and the nonviolation of the security of the participating parties. Also, in this issue, the key to progress is the political will, the search for mutually acceptable solutions, but not the striving for gaining unilateral advantages through extreme demands. Therefore, the socialist states in Vienna asked the West this fundamental question: Is it ready and willing to search for a mutually acceptable solution, or does it want to continue persisting on its "packet" of verification measures, which often goes beyond the framework of the sensible and the realistic? The future will show whether the NATO states--participants in the talks--will persist on their position, which has no chance of success--all or nothing, or whether they will join the effort to find realistic solutions.

Adhering to the policy of a good example, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev in his statement of 15 January 1986, in which he formulated the historical program of the liquidation of the nuclear threat, confirmed in regard to the Vienna talks the preparedness of the Soviet Union

and the Warsaw Pact member-states to agree on reasonable verification measures, and proposed expansion of the number of verification measures concerning the partial agreement by setting up permanent checkpoints to monitor the entry and exit of troops in the central European region. This proposal has elicited deserved interest and attention also in the West.

In accordance with its principled policy aimed at eliminating the threat of nuclear war, at reducing the level of military confrontation, at developing international relations in the spirit of peaceful coexistence and detente, the socialist countries participants in the Vienna talks, on 20 February 1986 came forward with a new constructive initiative. Proceeding from their proposal of partial agreement, they submitted an expanded draft agreement on the initial reduction of USSR and U.S. ground forces and their equipment, with a subsequent maintenance of level of the armed forces and equipment in central Europe. It is a proposal that develops, defines, and complements the project of the socialist countries of 14 February 1985, takes into consideration the positive parts of the Western response of 5 December, and proposes a compromise solution on the issues on which agreement has not been arrived at yet.

The constructive and compromise nature of this proposal of the socialist countries can be documented, for example, if one considers that they agree to a smaller number of the USSR and U.S. troops that would have to be drawn from central Europe within the framework of the first step, although they would prefer a greater number. If the United States were willing to withdraw 6,500 troops, the Soviet Union would be willing to withdraw 11,500 of its troops from that region. It complies with the NATO demand to exchange lists of USSR and U.S. troops that are to be withdrawn even before the signing of the agreement. The proposal agrees to prolonging the nonincrease period from 2 to 3 years, and of the entire agreement from 3 to 4 years. It proposes exchanging data on the two sides' numerical troop strength in central Europe prior to the freeze, and then updating the data annually. It proposes the notification on transfers of ground forces, calling up reserves, and military exercises of 20,000 or more ground troops. It expands the sum of verification measures by setting up three or four permanent checkpoints monitoring the entry and exit of troops in the eastern as well as western parts of central Europe. It anchors the parties' right to verification on the spot in case of a substantial request. It agrees to setting up a permanent consultative commission for flexibly /opertivne/ discussing issues connected with the agreement's fulfillment.

It is only logical that the socialist countries demand in this agreement that the presumed commitments regarding the initial reduction and consequent freeze apply not only to troops, but also to their equipment and combat technology, and in place of exaggerated and unrealistic verification measures they propose a balanced, reasonable, and adequate supervision of the commitments adopted by the two parties.

Now it depends on the political will of the NATO member-states whether they will sufficiently appreciate the new constructive initiative of the socialist countries, and whether they will be willing to accept their request so that one will be able to start working on editing /redakcia/ a new agreement. The world public demands concrete results from the disarmament process. The year

1986 could become a milestone of the Vienna disarmament forum. It is high time to strengthen the authority of the Vienna talks, and in accordance with the mandate to contribute to the signing of the first agreement in Vienna, to the deepening of trust and consolidating the stability and security on the European continent.

/12228

CSO: 5200/3026

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

NATO'S MBFR APPROACH 'INFLEXIBLE, NEGATIVE'

AU212110 Bratislava ROLNICKE NOVINY in Slovak 20 Mar 86 p 7

/Milan Smolik commentary: "The West Has Failed to Demonstrate Its Interest; the Socialist Countries' Realistic Concept in Vienna"/

/Text/ When the talks between 7 Warsaw Pact member-states and 12 NATO member-states on reducing armed forces and armaments in central Europe--an area comprising a common border between the two military alliances and, hence, of the greatest risk of a confrontation--resumed in Vienna this year, many political observers, including those in the West, wrote that "after 12 years of dialogue, the outlines of a possible agreement have finally become known." These are words that were used by the British newspaper THE OBSERVER. And the French LE MONDE asserted: "The gap between positions with regard to the initial agreement has been narrowed...."

These assessments were made after the socialist countries had given a constructive reply to the proposal of the NATO states of last December and further expanded, detailed, and complemented their own previous proposal of February 1985. This has caused the positions held in Vienna by the countries of the Warsaw Pact and the countries of NATO to draw closer together; on 12 points, the new proposal took into consideration the Western position.

In the original proposal, the Soviet Union had recommended a reduction by 20,000 Soviet soldiers and 13,000 American soldiers within a year. In their new proposal, the socialist countries agreed to a smaller initial reduction, as proposed by the West. Within a year after the agreement's becoming effective, the USSR and the United States would thus withdraw from central Europe 11,500 and 6,500 members of their ground forces respectively, including equipment and combat technology associated with these units. The socialist countries also agreed with the Western proposal that the Soviet and American troops be reduced by formations, provided that the reduction will involve combat and supply units. They also assented to information about the specific units subject to reduction to be provided prior to the signing of the agreement. Following the completion of the Soviet and American troop reductions, the signatories would undertake not to increase their armed forces and armaments for 3 years. This means that the socialist countries agreed with the "freeze" commitment which is to become valid immediately after the completion of the Soviet-American reduction as well as with the 3-year duration of the freeze.

The basic propositions of the proposed agreement also include a number of provisions concerning verification--starting with the establishment of three to four permanent observation points monitoring the entry and exit of any and all military contingents to and from the reduction area and ending with the possibility of onsite verification on the basis of a well-reasoned request. The proposal also provides for an exchange of information to update data on the troops subject to the nonincrease, as demanded by the West. Included in the proposal is also an article on setting up a consultative commission and its functions during the term of the agreement's validity. Envisaged is, furthermore, an exchange of information on movements of ground forces to, within, and from the reduction area, as well as the announcement of military maneuvers by ground forces.

The expectations of rapid progress in formulating the initial agreement have not materialized due to the continuing inflexible and negative Western attitude. Although the socialist countries have come up with compromise solutions on diverse aspects of the problem of verification, the West finds this to be still too little and demands excessively high and unbalanced verification measures that are not commensurate with the scale and nature of the commitments. On top of this, the NATO states exclude armaments from the reduction and freeze process, which in fact violates the mandate of the conference. To political observers, the Western position in Vienna appears to be one of rejecting both the reduction and limitation of armaments, rejecting the enforcement of measures that would numerically limit all armed forces of all direct participants in the Vienna talks, and opposing any curb on the scale of military maneuvers. Valerian Mikhailov, the Soviet delegation head, expressed this pointedly when he said that, so far, the West has been offering in Vienna a reduction that is worth a groschen but demanding verification worth 100 schillings. The contours of an agreement are thus known, but the possibility of such an agreement being concluded is not yet on the horizon.

/12228

CSO: 5290/3026

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

CTK REPORTS ON TALKS AT MBFR PLENARY MEETING

AU171448 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 14 Mar 86 p 7

/CTK correspondent's Vienna dispatch: "No Trace of Genuine Interest on the Part of the West; the 38th Round of the Vienna Talks Is Drawing to its End"/

/Text/ Vienna (CTK correspondent)—Yesterday's penultimate plenary meeting of the 38th round of the Vienna talks on reducing armed forces and arms in central Europe furnished evidence of two diametrically opposed approaches to weighty issues, the solution of which should in the final analysis contribute to lowering the level of military confrontation on the European Continent.

Whereas the British delegate, Michael Alesander, in his speech merely confirmed once again the inflexible and negative Western attitude and its complete lack of political will to contribute its share to the attainment of tangible results at the Vienna talks, the Soviet delegation head, Valerian Mikhaylov, spoke about the possibilities and prerequisites of fast progress. He rejected the tendentious assertion of the NATO states to the effect that the draft agreement submitted by the socialist countries on 20 February "is not an adequate reply" to the Western proposal of last December.

In this connection he said that the question arises as to whether the NATO countries really want to agree on a mutually acceptable compromise, whether they are interested in it in the first place. So far there is nothing to testify to this. Their positions and pronouncements are changing, they renege on their previous positions, and reject that of which they only recently approved. All at once and without any indepth analysis, their representatives in Vienna assumed a negative attitude both to our draft agreement and to the recommendation of the Warsaw Pact member-countries to start joint work on the text of an agreement.

Valerian Mikhaylov stressed that work on the text of the agreement, as recommended by the socialist countries, would make it possible to enshrine in the legal formulations of a treaty that on which the two sides have already agreed and to draw up individual articles. In short, it would make it possible to make headway. Outstanding issues could be left in brackets for the time being, as is customary in international practice. At the same time he called on the NATO states to proceed in a businesslike manner at the Vienna talks and thereby contribute to the fast attainment of a mutually acceptable agreement.

/12228

CSO: 3200/3026

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

CURRENT STATE OF MBFR TALKS ASSESSED

AU241506 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 21 Mar 86 pp 1, 7

/Bedrich Zagar Vienna dispatch: "After the 38th Round of Negotiations a 2-month Break; the West Is Dodging the Issue, But Exacerbating its Rhetoric" /

/Text/ Instead of constructively searching for possibilities to draw the stands closer, so as to be finally able to start working out the text of the agreement, the West has exacerbated its rhetoric at yesterday's session--the last session of the 38th round of the Vienna negotiations on reducing the strength of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. Obviously, in this exacerbation it has found a way to evade the convincing arguments of the socialist countries and to produce the impression that its own stances are well informed.

However, the businesslike nature of negotiations cannot be replaced by sharp-sounding but empty, words, as Ambassador Robert Blackwill, head of the American delegation, strove to do when he spoke yesterday on behalf of the participating delegations of the NATO countries. In his speech he referred to statements made by Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, as though wanting to use them in support of his accusations addressed to the socialist countries which, according to him, are making the negotiations difficult. He selected only those of Mikhail Gorbachev's words which suited him.

Yes, Mikhail Gorbachev did say that the Soviet Union is willing to accede to control measures, and even to on-the-spot inspection, provided these measures are sensible and will serve the issue. The socialist states inserted into their complementary proposals of 1 month ago specific ideas on setting up control points during troops movements to, and from, the given area. However, Ambassador Blackwill ignored this, because--as he said in his speech yesterday--he did not intend to react to the proposals made by the socialist countries since they contain "unacceptable notions." According to Blackwill, the West no longer has anything to revise in its stances--it is going to wait only for the socialist states' "corrections" /korektury/. What an original notion of negotiations between two partners with equal rights!

Ambassador Ludek Handl, head of the Czechoslovak delegation, took the floor on behalf of the socialist countries; he issued the reminder that the proposals made by the socialist states on a partial agreement are a truly bilaterally

acceptable way out of the many years of stagnation in the Vienna negotiations. The West itself reminded the practical nature of this concept last December. But now it can find nothing good in it; on the contrary, it is insisting even more vehemently on its totally unfounded verification measures which, after the "numerical barrier," are now becoming a new barrier at the Vienna negotiations. Instead of striving for an agreement on ending down the military confrontation in Central Europe, as assigned by the mandate of the Vienna negotiations, the NATO delegations are striving to achieve some kind of verification agreement.

Ambassador Randl pointed out the West's inflexibility, which borders almost on an ultimatum. For instance, it is written in the Western press: "In the points covered in the associated measures will become part of the agreement; only thus will it be possible to sign the agreement." It would be desirable, the Czechoslovak Ambassador said, that the Western partners weigh all aspects and adopt their stands on the basis of political realism.

During the following press conference the Western representative was not asked a single question. Obviously the ultimatum-like tone has also affected the journalists, who seemed to consider questions superfluous. Jozef Bostak, member of the Czechoslovak delegation, conducted the press conference for the socialist countries. When asked by the journalists how he assessed the West's accusation that the socialist states are slowing the negotiations to stagnate, he said that the socialist countries have always respected the West's demands. They have also proved this by agreeing, for instance, to the reduction of troops strengths involved in the first phase of withdrawal, although they would far rather see higher figures here; similarly they have met the West halfway in control measures. All these were compromises in the interests of the agreement. And what did the West do? It is merely insisting on its "verifications" and reproaching the socialist countries that they do not want to adjust. If the negotiations have changed into mere "antitheses," as the head of the American delegation claimed, then it should be the West which ought to ponder on this. "After all, there are sufficient facts on hand, and everybody can judge for himself," Jozef Bostak told the journalists in conclusion.

The Vienna negotiations will have a 2-month break, and the delegations will reconvene in the Hofburg on 11 May.

712226

CSO: 5200/3016

CANADIAN ARMS ATTORNEYS, PAPERWORK, CLARE AND PARSONS

International Convention on Arms Control

Source: THE TORONTO STAR (in English) 7 Apr 86, p. 40

[Text]

OTTAWA (CP) — Canada should pull out of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and join the European Defence Community (EDC), establish a system for global arms management and work on a program of "No Nukes," a former high-ranking Canadian diplomat says.

George Ignatieff, chairman of the University of Toronto and the Development Action at Queen's University this year, says that membership in NATO will inevitably involve Canada in the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) and jeopardize the country's security.

Prime Minister Brian Mulroney is due to meet President Ronald Reagan in Washington in two weeks to discuss the terms of a new NATO agreement.

Ignatieff, an adviser on disarmament to the federal government, said this week that Ottawa's decision to allow the participation of Canadian companies in Star Wars research is likely "to entrench us further into the whole future concept of Fortress America, at the expense of (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) alliance solidarity as a whole."

Ignatieff said the stability of the NATO alliance, as well as relations between East and West, hinge on whether NATO rejects SDI — the formal name for Star Wars — and

accepts the Soviet initiative to examine the first use of nuclear weapons.

Canada should get out of NATO and move with its allies into changing the nuclear strategy of the NATO alliance, Ignatieff said.

Earlier this spring "not a national arrangement is a better choice of the United States," Ignatieff said, "but we should not have any initiative to join."

"Considering Canada's role in high technology, including space research, we should be in the forefront of activity in Star Wars, rather than Star Wars," Ignatieff said.

Canada faces the challenge of supporting the International Committee for Monitoring Agency proposed by France, a European Space Agency through which Canada can contribute to peaceful research in outer space, and Europe, a European plan for launching high-tech is open for peaceful purposes.

Defense experts

Ignatieff, who participated in some negotiations over many of the world's trouble spots in the 1960s and 1970s, said that Canada's strategy of survival should include establishment of a crisis management centre.

Canada must provide both the facility and the expertise, but the management of the crisis would be in the hands of the diplomatic and defense experts from the two superpowers.

Security of Food Supply

Security of Food Supply of the United States

(Cont.)

The United States is a large country with a large population. It is a country of many different kinds of people and many different kinds of food. It is a country of many different kinds of food and many different kinds of people.

The United States is a large country with a large population. It is a country of many different kinds of people and many different kinds of food. It is a country of many different kinds of food and many different kinds of people.

The United States is a large country with a large population. It is a country of many different kinds of people and many different kinds of food. It is a country of many different kinds of food and many different kinds of people.

The United States is a large country with a large population. It is a country of many different kinds of people and many different kinds of food. It is a country of many different kinds of food and many different kinds of people.

The United States is a large country with a large population. It is a country of many different kinds of people and many different kinds of food. It is a country of many different kinds of food and many different kinds of people.

The United States is a large country with a large population. It is a country of many different kinds of people and many different kinds of food. It is a country of many different kinds of food and many different kinds of people.

The United States is a large country with a large population. It is a country of many different kinds of people and many different kinds of food. It is a country of many different kinds of food and many different kinds of people.

The United States is a large country with a large population. It is a country of many different kinds of people and many different kinds of food. It is a country of many different kinds of food and many different kinds of people.

Page 1

100-100000

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

23 April 86